

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

ANGELINA VELAZQUEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

**COURTYARD MANAGEMENT
CORPORATION,**

Defendant.

Case No. 3:16-cv-1438-SB

ORDER

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge Stacie F. Beckerman issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on July 11, 2018. ECF 60. Judge Beckerman recommended that the Court grant Defendant Courtyard Management Corporation's Supplemental Motion for Attorney's Fees (ECF 58), approve Defendant's Bill of Costs (ECF 51), and deny as moot Defendant's original motion for attorney's fees (ECF 49). No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), the court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations,

“the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress . . . intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review findings and recommendations *de novo* if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge Beckerman’s Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** Judge Beckerman’s Findings and Recommendation, ECF 60. Defendant’s Supplemental Motion for Attorney’s Fees (ECF 58) is GRANTED, Defendant’s Bill of Costs (ECF 51) is APPROVED, and Defendant’s original Motion for Attorney’s Fees (ECF 49) is DENIED as moot. Defendant is awarded \$15,155.00 in attorney’s fees and \$310.05 in costs, for a total award of \$15,465.05.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 31st day of July, 2018.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge